

welfare by changing the pension law and making it easier for companies to raid their pension funds. That money can be used right now under current law essentially only for health care benefits and maybe some employee stock ownership plans, but under their proposal it can be used for executive bonuses, it can be used for hostile takeovers, and just to paint two scenarios here because it is going to make it very attractive for companies to go out and try to find other companies to raid in order to bleed down that pension fund, and let us assume that you are not someone who is hostile and wants to take over other companies, but that you own a medium-sized company, you have been good to your employees, you have got your pension fund built up above what the law requires because you want to maybe increase the health care benefits for your retired people as they get older.

What does this do? It says to you, as the owner of that company, "You better take the money out of that fund because, if you don't, you're going to become a sitting duck for a hostile takeover," and they are going to come in, and they are going to take the money out of that fund. So you have got two full problems. First you have got the problem that you have got the hostile people who will come in and want to bleed the funds, and then you got the good companies, the companies that want to take care of their workers, the companies that want to take care of their retirees, and you are creating what is almost a mandatory incentive for them to take the money out of the fund so that they are not the subject of a hostile takeover.

So I think that there is a multiplier effect there that is going to make it more and more difficult for people who have put money in their pension funds to see the fruits of their labor in their later years, and I think it is wrong, wrong, wrong for us to be going in that direction again. It is another example of the wrong direction.

Ms. KAPTUR. If the gentleman would yield, I cannot tell you how many companies we have in Ohio where workers work let us say for 30 years, and when their pension funds went belly up, they said to the workers, "Oh, gee, sorry, we don't have your pension dollars," or, "You worked 30 years? Well, we can only pay you 10 years."

I just met a gentleman the other day who worked for Eastern Airlines for over a decade on the east coast and who had to move to Florida to completely change his occupation. He is now in his fifties, enrolled in a 5-year program in environmental agriculture, a highly skilled airplane mechanic who, if he is lucky, will get maybe \$300 a year when he reaches 65 from that company for his years of employment there, much less than he would have expected to have gotten in his retirement years. So we have got people all over this country who have been robbed of their pension benefits.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. OK. In closing let us figure out now we are at the end of the night, we are still in the stalemate. Congressman PALLONE, what should we do to get the ball rolling?

Mr. PALLONE. Well, I think that the only answer is that there has to be recognition on the Republican side that they are just not going to be able to take money from Medicare and also from Medicaid in these large amounts, these cuts, and use them for a tax cut for the wealthy.

□ 2245

I think it would be very easy to come to agreement between both sides of the aisle, as well as with the President, by simply cutting back on, or I should say putting back a lot of the cuts on Medicare as well as Medicaid, not increasing premiums as much as has been proposed here, and, as a consequence, also cutting back on this tax cut for the wealthy. That is the basis for an agreement on the budget I think we can all live with.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentlewoman from Florida, what is her constructive analysis?

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think tomorrow we are going to have an opportunity to do either a 24-hour or 48-hour clean resolution and then allow them to continue to do the work on the appropriations. My constructive part on this would say, "I came here to do the job, I am willing to stay here, I voted last Friday to stay here over last weekend so we could avoid this kind of train wreck we have come to." I am willing to stay here again and work on this, but all I would ask is, I don't know that I was ever a part of what some would like to look back over the last and blame all the rest of us for, but I am really ready to sit down and work in a bipartisan manner to come up with a program that we can take care of people within this country, and I am not ashamed of the fact that I am a Democrat and believe that people need to come first in this country.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] her constructive comments on how to get the ball rolling.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, first of all we need a clean continuing resolution. We ought to have one similar to the one that was passed about 1½ months ago, without all the bells and whistles on it, that brings us below last year's level of spending, but without all these riders and everything else they have been trying to stick on.

I think also we should go back to regular order. And I have to say to the former Speaker, Jim Wright, if he is listening tonight, thank you for being a great Speaker. Thank you for clearing your bills on time. We should be doing the same with the appropriation bills.

I would say to President Clinton that I hope he keeps on his balanced budget target and hangs strong on Medicare.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Thank you all very much.

IT IS TIME WE GET OUR FINANCIAL HOUSE IN ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I know the time is getting late. You have been very gracious for being here for a long time, and I hope I can return the favor to the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in elective office for 21 years, 13 years in the State House in Connecticut, and now 8 years in Congress. When I was in the State House, I was always amazed that Congress could spend more money than it raised in revenues and deficit spend. I knew you did that when times were difficult and in times of war, but I could never understand how we could do that in times of peace. For the first basically 180 years of our history, our national debt was only \$375 billion; in 1975, \$375 billion. That funded the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, the Korean war, the Vietnam war, these real crises in our country.

After the Vietnam war, our deficit was \$375 billion. Since 1975, our deficits have grown to 4,900 billion. That is a thirteen-fold increase in our national debt, when times were good.

I vowed that when I came to Congress, I would be on that part of the equation that would look to get our financial house in order. This is our moment. Our moment is right now, to get our financial house in order, balance our budget. That is the first effort. The second effort is to save our trust funds, particularly Medicare, which is going insolvent next year, and becomes bankrupt in 7 short years. The Medicare fund that goes bankrupt funds all of hospital costs.

Our third effort is to transform our social and corporate welfare state into an opportunity society. That is a conservative word. It is a very important word. We are trying to give opportunity to people. Instead of being a caretaking government, we are looking to be a caring government. Instead of people giving them the food, we are looking to help them grow the seeds, and be able to self-sufficient.

I look at our society and I see too many 12-year-olds having babies, I see 14-year-olds selling drugs, I see 15-year-olds killing each other, I see 18-year-olds who cannot read their diplomas, I see 24-year-olds who have never had a job, not because jobs do not exist, but because they simply do not feel those jobs are for them, or maybe do not have the qualifications or feel they do not have the qualifications. I see 30-year grandparents.

In my political career, I have seen now three generations of welfare recipients. That has to end. We have an opportunity to end it in the next 2 years.

I am joined by my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, and I am really grateful that he is here. Before yielding to him, I would just like to enter into this whole debate of whether what we are doing is cutting spending, slowing the growth in spending, or simply not coming to grips at all with spending.

During the last 7 years, we spent about \$9 trillion. In the next 7 years, we expect to spend \$12 trillion; in other words, \$3 trillion more in the next 7 years, a significant sum. What we are trying not to do is spend over \$13 trillion. We are looking to not have the debt go up \$2 trillion more. In this 7-year budget plan that we have, it still would go up \$1 trillion. That is embarrassing in one way, but it certainly should give an indication that we are not being radical. We are spending more, the national debt goes up \$1 trillion, but it will not go up \$2 trillion if we have our way.

In the seventh year, we have slowed the growth of spending to the point where it intersects with revenue, and in the seventh year, we will have had a balanced budget.

What we are asking the President of the United States to do is join in that effort to balance the budget in 7 years. Obviously, we would like him to agree to our balanced budget of 7 years, but we are not requiring that to happen. He has his priorities, I am sure, and we have ours. We would have to sort that out. But the one thing we should be able to agree on on a common basis is getting our budget balanced in 7 years.

To that end, that is what we are doing. We are working to do that. It makes it a lot easier if the President weighs in and helps us in that effort, but if he does not, we are still going to keep on in this effort. Someone said to me, and then I will yield to my colleague, just about polls they said, "The President seems to be catching the imagination of the American people, that they have more faith in him right now than Congress. You are not looking too good in Congress with the polls."

I thought, "I don't know entirely how valid those polls are, but the one thing I know is that if President Lincoln had taken a poll during the height of his effort to keep our Union together, and he had decided based on the polls, he would have simply ended the war and not confronted the South." We would not be one nation under God, indivisible, we would have been, if President Lincoln had listened to polls and reacted to them, two nations, a North and a South.

For me, this is as epic a struggle. I feel for our Federal employees who are kind of caught in the middle of this. Ultimately we know we are going to downsize Government and they will be affected. I feel for them not knowing if

they should come to work tomorrow. But it is much bigger than our Federal employees. It is not a matter of getting our Federal employees back to work, it is a matter of getting an agreement with the White House that gets us on a glide path to a balanced budget.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA], and thank my colleague for participating in this special order.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut, for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague and I have been working with many of our friends in the House in developing a new process on how we work on the Republican side of the aisle, a process of participative involvement. It is one of the reasons that we as a group have really been able to get behind a unified vision.

The first step in our process as colleagues, as we work together, is to listen. We have developed a process for listening to each other, but more importantly, we have developed a process for listening to the American people. We did it a year and a half ago, as we went through the campaign process in 1994. We spend a lot of time listening to the American people, having them tell us what was important. They said, "We want an agenda in Washington that will reform Washington, that changes the way Washington does business."

We continued to hear people, in 1994, very anxious and concerned about where we were going with the deficit, with the budget, very concerned about the debt we were piling on our children. So I think we spent a lot of time listening to each other, but more importantly, listening to the American people and trying to understand their problems.

After we won the elections in 1994, we spent a lot of time trying to learn and understand the problem. We recognized, I think as you just pointed out, that to get to a balanced budget, we did not have to cut spending. We could grow spending, we just could not grow it as fast as what maybe Congress would like to have grown it; that if all we did was grow spending but grow it a little slower than what we had anticipated, we would get to a balanced budget.

We also learned that as we looked out into the year 2010 and a little beyond that, if we did not reform entitlement spending in, what is it, the year 2013, 100 percent of the revenues that the Government would collect would be used to pay for entitlement spending and interest on the debt, and there would not be any money left for anything else.

As we looked even closer, we looked out and we learned that 7 years out, the Medicare part A trust fund would be broke, so we learned a lot of things about the budget. For the last number of months, we have been trying to help, help people understand, help our colleagues here in Washington understand

what the implications were of the information that we have gathered, help the American people understand that if we continue down this irresponsible and reckless path of increased spending, increased spending beyond our limits, we are going to be facing some serious problems: children born today, in 1995, and over their lifetime, paying \$182,000 in taxes, not for anything that is going to benefit them, but for things that are benefiting us today. That \$182,000 is only going to cover the interest on the debt, their share of the interest on the debt, and that is for kids born today.

Mr. SHAYS. Not to pay back the debt, but just to pay the interest on the national debt.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. That is correct. They would pay an effective tax rate of around 82 percent over their lifetime if we did nothing, so we have listened to the American people, we have learned, and we have understood the problems. We are helping people understand the problems, and hopefully engaging them in the process to develop appropriate solutions, because the next thing is if we have listened, we have learned, and we have helped, the responsibility now comes, and this is what we are doing this week, we are leading.

Earlier this year we led with the Contract With America. We told people what we were going to do, then we went out and did it. All year we have been doing what we said we were going to do in 1994. We said we were going to get on a path to a balanced budget. We are leading. That is our vision, to get to a balanced budget, but more importantly, the benefits—and we talked about shared sacrifice for getting to a balanced budget.

Last week we had a policy committee hearing where we had outside experts come in and talk to us about the benefits of balancing the budget. They said, "We do not know where you are talking about shared sacrifice. Number one, Federal spending is still going up. It is going to go up from \$1.5 trillion in 1995 to \$1.8 trillion, a 27-percent increase in Federal spending. There is plenty of money to address the needs that this country is facing."

They said, "You should not be talking about shared sacrifice. You ought to be talking about shared benefits of balancing the budget." The vision is the shared benefits of lower interest rates, of an economy that is stronger because we are going to be more able to compete internationally, we are going to be better equipped to create new jobs, better-paying jobs. This impacts the kids that are going out and getting a student loan, they are going to pay less in interest rates. It affects the homeowners because they are going to be paying lower interest rates.

Greenspan came, and my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut, and I are both on the Committee on the Budget. Alan Greenspan has come in and said we will face lower interest

rates if we demonstrate to the financial markets that we are serious about balancing the budget. That is what it is about this week.

We have this vision where we are going. We would like to do it with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. We would like to do it with the President, but they have to share our vision of getting to a balanced budget and getting there within 7 years. We have our strategies for doing that. We are going to not cut spending, we are going to slow the growth of Federal spending. We are going to allow the American people to share with us in some of the benefits of decreasing the rate of spending increases. The projects we now face, I mean everything is coming together at one point in time.

□ 2300

We do need to finish the appropriations projects. Later on this week we are going to have the Balanced Budget Act of 1995, which changes entitlement spending to put it in line with the balanced budget. We are going to have to increase the debt limit. I know my colleague from Connecticut and I are not real excited about doing that, but we recognize that we cannot get to a balanced budget in 1 year or 2 years. I think that 7 years might be too long, but I think it is a reasonable time for us to change our behavior in Washington, to move to where we are today from deficit spending to a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding, and just to say to him that about a year and a half ago, actually a little longer, I went to my then-minority whip, NEWT GINGRICH and said to him, "The problem is not term limits, because if it is term limits, then you are the problem. The problem is," I said, "is 40 years of one-party control. Forty years of one-party control is wrong, whether it be Republican or Democrat."

Mr. Speaker, the next thing I knew was that I was being asked to participate in a group that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] heads. That is one of the things that I think people do not realize about the Speaker, is that if you go to him with a suggestion or concern, and the next thing he has empowered you and you are now a part of the process.

He put me on a group of people that you headed, Congressman HOEKSTRA, and it was basically an effort of how to decide how do we end 40 years of one-party control. This was the group that ultimately worked on the Contract With America, and the Capitol steps event.

Why was there a Capitol steps event? We wanted to catch the imagination of the American people and let them know that, if they were to elect us, that it would not be business as usual. It would be like in Great Britain or in Canada when there is a change of government. Mr. Speaker, we said, "Elect

us and this is what we are going to do." We had a signed Contract With America and we invited all the challengers to participate.

I remember the incredible outcry that people had at first. "How can you sign a Contract With America?" And I said, "Well, have you read what is in it?" They said, "No." I said, "Why don't you look at it and then tell me what you think."

The press was critical, and I remember the press being critical before the election. I said, "What do you think the majority party's Contract With America, the 10 things, the 8 things they want to do on opening day, the 10 things they want to do in the first 100 days is?"

Is not it remarkable that this Contract With America does not criticize President Clinton, it does not criticize Democrats? It is a positive plan for America. So one of the things that I want to do, since I have not had a special order with the gentleman from Michigan, is I wanted to thank him for his leadership in helping to devise this Contract With America that gave us a real vision and a strategy for accomplishing change.

The gentleman talked about a "listen, learn, help, and lead model." The gentleman has talked in a sense about our vision strategies and our projects and our tactics, and all of it was positive.

When people said to me, "Well, you had this Contract With America, and admittedly, it helped you get elected, but you will not implement it." We implemented those eight reforms on opening day. Then in the first 100 days, we implemented 10 major reforms. I look at those 10 major reforms, and one of them was a balanced budget amendment.

People said, "You voted for a balanced budget amendment but you would not be so stupid as to vote to balance the budget." Whether they call it stupid or not, I guess they meant it from the political context; that it is heavy lifting and we are taking on a lot of special interests.

But my pride is that we have this Contract With America which is a positive plan for this country. We voted for a balanced budget amendment, but we did not stop there. We voted to balance the budget.

If the gentleman would just let me continue just a little longer, we are slowing the growth in spending as the gentleman has pointed out. In some cases we are cutting programs, particularly in discretionary programs, but in a lot of cases we are merely slowing the growth of programs.

The earned income tax credit that helps those who are the poorest, they end up not paying taxes. They are the working poor, and they actually get something in return. People are saying on the other side of the aisle that we are cutting the earned income tax credit. Today it is \$19.8 billion. In the seventh year it grows to \$27.5 billion. That is a significant increase.

The School Lunch Program. They said we were cutting the School Lunch Program. It is \$6.3 billion today. In 5 years it will be \$7.8 billion.

The Student Loan Program. They are saying we are cutting the Student Loan Program. All we are asking is that students pay interest on a period after graduation for the next 6 months, when the Federal Government has paid the interest. Now we are saying the students will pay the interest and they can defer it and amortize it over the length of the program. We are going to spend \$25.5 billion today and it will grow, by 2002, to \$36 billion; \$36 billion from \$24 billion. It is a 50-percent increase. Only in this place when we spend 50 percent more do people call it a cut.

Then I look at Medicaid and Medicare. Medicaid, we are going to spend \$329 billion of additional dollars in the next 7 years that we did not spend in the last 7. We are going to go from \$89 to \$124 billion.

In Medicare, which is an incredible program that we have devised to give people choice, it is going to grow from \$178 billion today to \$273 billion in 7 years. We are going to spend \$674 billion more in the next 7 years than we did in the last 7. Again, I say only in this place when we spend \$674 billion more do people call it a cut.

On a per capita basis, they say more people are getting into the program. But we are going on a per capita basis from \$4,800 per beneficiary, per elderly, to \$6,700 per beneficiary, per elderly. That is a 47-percent increase per beneficiary. That is an increase any way we look at it.

Mr. Speaker, I am so proud of what this Republican majority is doing. And I speak to my constituents in my district who are Republican, Democrat, unaffiliated, who do not vote at all. There are things that my party can be criticized for, but one thing it cannot be criticized for is that it cannot be criticized for not doing some heavy lifting and not trying to save this country from bankruptcy, because we are trying to save Medicare from bankruptcy. We are ultimately trying to save this country from bankruptcy.

Mr. Speaker, we want to stop mortgaging the farm so that our kids have such a great debt that they cannot pay it back. We want to begin to say no more debt, no more annual deficits which at the end of the year add to the national debt.

In the seventh year, our deficits disappear. They become zero. Our national debt does not keep going up and we have done it by allowing spending to go up. We simply want to slow the growth in that spending. And in the process, we allow for this social corporate welfare state to be transformed into what is truly an opportunity society.

There is going to be much more opportunity. We can go on. What is the benefit of getting this deficit down? I mean the gentleman from Michigan

has pointed out obviously interest rates go down. Mortgages go down. Car loans go down. Student loan costs go down. Even though we ask students pay a little more interest for 6 months, they are going to pay a lot less interest during the entire period of their loan. Businesses will start to invest more because money will be cheaper. When they invest more, they are going to create more jobs.

We borrow 42 percent of the money that is available for investment. We, the Federal Government, borrow 42 percent of all savings to fund the national debt. That has to end.

Mr. Speaker, I notice we are joined by my colleague from Maine. I would like to welcome him and yield back time to the gentleman from Michigan if he would like to go on, and then I would love, Mr. LONGLEY, if you would like to enter in. He looks like he is ready to enter in.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I would like to make a couple of points, building off of what my colleague from Connecticut talked about. I think they really do talk about how we want to work as a majority, the kind of vision that we have for how we want to whole House to work. It is that we want to focus on a positive message.

Mr. Speaker, we have a positive message. We have, I think, all a positive vision for where this country needs to go and what we want to do. So we can talk about where we want it to be in the future. We can talk about it in a very, very positive way.

In a way, that reaches across to the other side of the aisle, and reaches out to the President and says, "We have a vision and a very positive vision. And we really would like you to work with us."

I think again on the Committee on the Budget, we are willing to work with Members who share this vision of financial stability and financial soundness. In the meetings that we had where we kicked off the year in the Committee on the Budget, we were joined by one our colleagues from the other side of the aisle who said, "I share your vision for restoring this country to financial soundness," and that gentleman participated in all of our meetings because he recognized that where we wanted to go was where he wanted to go.

We recognized that it was going to be hard work. Getting to a balanced budget, I think we have found out, has not been easy. We have many differences from the Northeast to the West, to the South, to the Midwest. We all have our different priorities. But when we have come together as 234 Members and said, "We share this vision of getting to a balanced budget," and we keep our focus on that end goal, we have all been able to put aside some of our personal desires and our personal priorities and say, "It is more important for us to reach that goal together, because that is the only way that we are going to get there."

□ 2310

We are willing to put aside part of our personal interests because we share that objective of getting to a balanced budget. It is going to be hard work. I hope that the President, that he comes out and says, I will do it with you. I will balance it, because we will get a better solution because we will have 435 Members and the President taking a look and scrubbing our proposals. It will get better if we hang onto that balancing the budget within 7 years.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I think the key point is that we believe that at the very latest we should balance the budget in 7 years. Someone said what is so magical about 7 years. Nothing except for the fact that over 300 Members of this House, Republicans and Democrats, have voted for a balanced budget amendment to be balanced in 7 years. So over 300 or more than three-quarters, almost three-quarters of the Members here voted for a 7-year balanced budget. Candidly, nothing magical about a 7-year budget. I think it should be 4 or 5. But at the very least, within 7. I think the gentleman's point that the President could make it a better budget, we are not saying it has to be our 7-year budget, "our" being Republican. It can be "our" being Democrat and Republican, a 7-year budget.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. We have seen that. This is not your 7-year budget. It is not mine. If you developed one, it probably would have been different than mine. But we have put aside our differences and agreed on one that we can get that kind of unanimity on. I just want to say, we are also making some key structural changes in programs that are going to reform programs and that are going to make these programs better for the long term.

I think the other thing that we have to recognize is, maybe one of my colleagues would like to share on this, the dynamics, after the year 2000, especially on entitlement programs do not get any better. If we blink in 1995, what happens in 2005 with the baby boomers, the dynamics are working against us. All the entitlement spending on Medicare, Social Security, and all of these programs is going to skyrocket as the baby boomers get there. And so if we do not solve or start addressing this problem in 1995, it is not going to go away. It is only going to get worse. That is why today, yesterday and the next 7 to 10 days are so, so critical to get this under control.

I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY].

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments. I think the first thing that I would like to pick up on is what both of you have been saying which is that we have a positive agenda. We are not here to criticize anyone else. We are here to deal constructively with the Nation's problems, try to respond to what the public demanded last November. And I think it is important that we make a point that the easiest thing in the world for us to do as Mem-

bers of Congress is to come in here and pretend that these problems do not exist. The easiest thing in the world is to say, sure, Mr. President, spend all the money you want. Go ahead and borrow all the money you want. But we know that it would not be right. And it has been a darn tough challenge over the last 10 months to take a look at a \$1.5 trillion budget and make the kinds of adjustments, frankly, not the kinds of cuts that are being described, but adjustments in terms of a slower rate of growth in Government spending so that we can get to a point of having a balanced budget by the year 2002.

But again, I want to go back particularly because earlier this evening, there were Members on the floor that were discussing the fact that we should have had all our work done by July or August. The point that I would like to make is, yes, prior Congresses have had all their work done by July or August. They spent as much money as they wanted to spend. And when they did not have enough money, they just raised taxes to pay for it.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I think my colleague from Connecticut probably will want to jump in, our research shows that there have been nine Government shutdowns since 1981. And in that same period of time, there have been 57 continuing resolutions. Congress has not always gotten its work done in the first part of September.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I think we can be very candid. I would love it if we had had this budget done by October 1. I am not going to say because it happened in the past we should have done it, because we would like to think that we are different. I think the challenge has been that for the first time we are trying to balance the budget and get our financial house in order. We have taken on every special interest group you can imagine. By special interest group, I do not even mean that in a derogatory way. We have just taken every group and said that they need to share in this wonderful, and I say wonderful, opportunity to get this financial house in order. Because ultimately the benefits will be extraordinary. But it has not been ready by October 1.

But the one point I make is that by Friday we will have the job done. We will give the President a balanced budget. It will get us on a glidepath to a balance in 7 years. It will still allow spending to increase, and it would be easier if our colleagues on the other side of the aisle were contributing to helping.

Someone said, why have you not downsized Government, and we said we are, and we are in the process. But when a private company downsizes, the corporate people get together in a room. They decide the policy and they speak with unanimity. In this case, you have a government. We are trying to downsize the Government. And you have part of the board of directors on the other side saying, no, we should not downsize government and we should

not control the growth in spending. But we are going to get the job done.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. In downsizing government, I came from a company that downsized. Actually, when we downsized in the private sector, when we got done the number of employees and our costs were actually less. Remember when we are downsizing in Washington, we are downsizing a \$1.5 trillion budget. And in 7 years it will be \$1.8 trillion budget. So downsizing in the private sector is a little different than downsizing in Washington.

Mr. SHAYS. It is. And it has not been easy. But the bottom line is, we are doing our best. I am really proud of the job we have been doing.

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I think that the other point that needs to be made is that we have been given literally three or four different plans by the administration. And I think that it has been a challenge for us to sort through these different options in terms of trying to reach the honest objective of a balanced budget.

I think one of the things that was just astounding to me as a new Member of Congress was to come to Washington, to come to this body and to discover that there is a significant portion of the Congress and the administration that has no intention whatsoever of balancing the budget.

In fact, I think it is fair to say that this entire debate that we are now engaged in that began in earnest last night with the failure of the President to come to some agreement with the leaders of the Congress is that the bottom line is, they do not want to balance the budget. And I think I would defer to what the gentleman from Connecticut said, the issue is no later than 7 years. We will be lucky, frankly, if we have 7 years to balance the budget. And within that 7-year time frame, we are going to be willing to be as accommodating as we can in terms of different senses of priorities. But we have got to put an end to this mindlessness of just continuing debt as far as the eye can see because it is just not going to work for this country. It is going to destroy this country.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, half of our budget are entitlements: Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and a whole host of other entitlements, food stamps, welfare. You fit the title, you get the benefit. That is half of our budget. I do not get to vote on it. You do not get to vote on it. It does not come out of the appropriations committee. It is on automatic pilot.

Basically we have another 15 percent of our budget that is on automatic pilot, too. It is mandatory spending. It is interest on the national debt. I have been here 8 years now. I voted on one-third of the budget. The reason why Gramm-Rudman failed, one of the reasons that process that was intended to control the growth of spending because it only looked at what we call discretionary spending, the spending that funds the executive branch, the legisla-

tive branch, and the judicial branch, all the different departments and agencies in the executive branch, all the grants there, then foreign aid and then defense spending. That is what it basically looks at.

And we have been trying to control the growth of spending by just focusing on domestic spending, when we know and Mr. Panetta, when he was a Member of Congress, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, he said, we are ultimately not going to control the growth of spending until we control the growth of entitlements. This is the first Congress that has taken on that task.

It is leading me to the point, my colleague may have wondered where I was headed here. He made the point that we have this incredible opportunity to balance the budget in 7 years. But even when we do it, we still have to come to grips with the baby boomers that start entering Social Security in the year 2010. And by the year 2030, you have 65- to 85-year-old baby boomers in the system, totally utilizing all the funds. And the system quickly becomes bankrupt.

So if we cannot come to grips with getting, slowing the growth of entitlements now, if we cannot do that now, we are doomed in the future. That is the bottom line. So we have to begin to slow the growth of entitlements and then ultimately we will have to revisit this issue on a bipartisan basis.

I will tell you this, I do not think it is going to be possible for one party to take that issue on like we are trying to take this issue on now.

□ 2320

When the experts came in last week and they talked about the advantages in how getting to a balanced budget is going to free us up, I mean it is going to drive to a stronger economy. But as we have talked about reforms that need to take place here in Washington, about just about how we budget, they said, you know, just think, when you actually lay out a plan, and you start going down the path of a balanced budget, think of how it will free us up to make the reforms that we need to make. If we actually—what is one of the stronger arguments against a balanced budget amendment? Well, nobody has laid out a path. Well, we have actually, we are going down the path. Maybe we can find that one more Senator, or we can find that one more person in the other body, that will vote for a balanced budget amendment so that balancing the budget does not become a nice to every year, it becomes a have to, it becomes the law of the land that we will not fall into this trap again.

Mr. SHAYS. Like every State in this country has to balance its budget, and obviously during times of emergencies, then during times of emergencies we can have a deficit budget, but only in emergencies.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. So that we have a realistic chance then of getting to

that, changing the law of the land. It will enable us perhaps to do budget reform so that we can identify capital spending versus expense spending so we can do some budget reform. We maybe actually can even run the budget like the private sector does so that when accountants came in and took a look at our books, they would say, "Yeah, that makes sense."

How does Washington run today? The biggest budget in the country; how do we run it? We run it on a cash basis. No company in the country would pass any financial test by any auditing firm if they ran on a cash basis. The do accrual accounting. We have got liabilities out there for Federal employees who are earning pensions. If we are in the private sector, we would have to be setting money aside to make sure that that money is there to pay their pensions. We do not do that for Federal employees because we run on a cash basis.

I mean it is unbelievable, but, if we get to a balanced budget, maybe we can make that reform. Like the gentleman said, if we get to a balanced budget, maybe Congress can grab back this entitlement monster, not to change the programs, but to assume the responsibility each and every year, which is ours, that says, yes, we are going to spend this much money to provide these services rather than it being automatic. Entitlement spending is one of I do not know how it ever got here, but when Congress gave that authority away and said we are automatically going to spend that money without reviewing it each and every year, we gave up our responsibility in loss—well, we did not lose accountability, but we put in place a monster that has gotten out of control. If we actually get, as we move to a balanced budget, these are the kinds of reforms that we can get back in, and we can say we are actually going to run this country under the types of financial rules and regulations that insure long-term financial soundness.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LONGLEY. I just would pick up on what the gentleman from Michigan is saying.

You have I think, and again I want to speak as a new Member and as somebody who is new to this body, albeit we have been here now for 10 or 11 months. It has been amazing to me to see the extent to which those who have been in Washington, particularly those who have been here much longer than any of the three of us, just take it for granted that we continue to spend and acquire the level of debt that we have been acquiring, and not only do they take it for granted, but even the entire, all of the, committee structures, the language that we use, everything is built on the assumption that Washington will take more and more of what the public is producing and having less and less go to the average citizen who is across the country, that it is almost—it is a mind set that we here in

Washington have a right to take the money from the public and spend it the way that we want to and that it is almost heretical to even suggest the idea that we should be restoring power to individual citizens across the country, the most basic form of power, which is the ability to control your own income, and again the extent to—the public is confused about what we are discussing here, and again there is not anybody that regrets the partisanship more than I do and wishes that we could get constructive dialog from the other side of the aisle.

But the fact of the matter is this is all about whether or not we are going to balance the budget.

Mr. SHAYS. I was thinking, if the gentleman will yield, just in terms of determination. You know, I have had some people say, "What's so magical about a 7-year budget," and, as I pointed out, nothing is magical about it if we can do it in 4 or 5 years. If I were running for the President of the United States, I would want to tell the American people I would do it under my watch and not under somebody else's watch. So, nothing magical about 7 years. We could do it sooner.

But I was thinking, if I asked you, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and if the President of the United States said to you, "How do I get out of this mess?" I mean you all are insisting on a balanced budget amendment. I do not want to—I do not want to do what you are doing. How would you reach out to the President and say to him you need to be a part of this, and what are we asking the President to do?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Well, we are asking the President to sit down, understand our vision for where we want America to be, where we want America to be in 7 years, understand the vision, understand what we want America to look like, understand what we perceive the benefits of moving in this direction, and understand what we believe to be a very rational way of getting there, by just slowing the growth of the Federal spending.

Mr. SHAYS. And following your very model of listening, we would be listening to him as well as to how he would do it, and then we could, I would think, hope to marry that vision that we have, but clearly I think I would be saying to the President of the United States, "Mr. President, we need to balance the budget within 7 years, and you need to understand our determination on that issue. Over 300 Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats, felt that balancing the budget within that time was the outer limit. Now what goes in that budget can be a combination of our vision and your vision. How we do it is clearly open for debate. We think there also should be a tax cut. You think there should be a tax cut. We should determine how that should happen. But again that's a shared responsibility."

So we are really just saying to him, "Give us a balanced budget within 7 years."

Now what we could do when he did that is to say we have given you our 7-year budget, now you give us your 7-year budget. Let us see where the differences are, let us see what the similarities are, but by the President refusing to even agree to a 7-year budget, he has been able to basically stand on the sideline, almost as someone just watching this, and not weighing in. Ultimately he is the President, he has to weigh in.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Well, I mean the process that we could use with the President is very similar to what we did in the Committee on the Budget. I mean we spent what, 3, 4 months, the first 4 months of this year, going through it saying, "OK, we've agreed as what, 18-20 Members, that we are going to balance the budget. We brought in experts from all the different departments. We brought in our own knowledge, our own staff, our own biases."

□ 2330

We said, "OK. We have to get to here, we have to get to there." You had some ideas, I had some ideas, and we all shared our ideas.

Mr. SHAYS. We had to compromise.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. We fought through the issues. I do not know if we compromised, but we listened to each other, we learned from each other. At the end, the gentleman from Ohio, JOHN KASICH, he led. He said, "I have listened to all of you, I have taken your input. You know, some of you are going to win, some are going to lose, but we have to get off the dime. Here is where we are going."

We sat down at the end of the day and said, "I do not agree with all the decisions that were made, but you know what, this package is something that we can all get behind and we are going there." If the President says "I am going to balance the budget in 7 years," he can put his plan and we will get in the room again and we will start doing the same give and take, and if we are all agreed on that vision, it would free us all up to have a wonderful dialog and a wonderful debate about how we are going to get to a very positive future.

Mr. LONGLEY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, let us put the whole issue in its simplest terms, Mr. Speaker. There are some people who believe the budget should be balanced today. There are also some people who believe the budget should never be balanced, so you have today versus never.

In between, there are some that say 3 and 4 years, there may be some that say 10 years. The President at different times has said either 5 years, 10 years, never, and sometimes he said 8 or 9, depending on what day of the week it is. The fact of the matter is that we have settled on 7 because not only is it a reasonable compromise, but we have also looked at what the gentleman

from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] has anticipated in terms of the baby boomers and the tremendous pressure we face in the early part of the 21st century. These are some tough issues we need to deal with today to get them behind us, so that we can protect Medicare, protect Social Security for the generations to come.

But there is also something else that is very important, because 6 or 8 months ago we voted on the floor of this House for a balanced budget amendment. Three hundred Members of the Congress voted in favor of balancing the budget by the year 2002. That is what 300 Members said.

I guess the point that I would like to make is that sometimes there is a difference between what people say and what people are willing to do. The fact of the matter is that we have had 300 votes on record in this body for a 7-year balanced budget pursuant to the terms of the balanced budget amendment, and we are only doing exactly what we said we were going to do. That is what I find remarkable about all the disagreement and hullabaloo that we have been hearing on the floor of this House.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. What is that?

Mr. LONGLEY. Hullabaloo.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. It is a northeastern term.

Mr. SHAYS. It comes from Maine. I do not even know in Connecticut.

Mr. LONGLEY. I could come up with more terms, but I will save the dignity of this Chamber.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I was thinking that the President did come in with a 10-year budget. I got excited. At least we had a 10-year budget. But he did not have any details. Then we gave it to the Congressional Budget Office, and they said the 10-year budget is never in balance. They point out in the last 6 years, basically in 1997 his deficits would be \$205 billion, then it goes to \$203 billion, \$250 billion, \$221 billion, \$215 billion, \$209 billion, \$207 billion, \$206 billion. In the year 2005 it is at \$209 billion of deficits.

Really, what I think we would be asking the President to do is come in with a 7-year plan, your plan. We have our plan. Then let us compare it. Let us see where the similarities are. Let us see how we can go forward.

Mr. Speaker, we have 15 minutes left, and I would love to weigh in on one issue, that is Medicare. It is just an example of a program that we designed which I think saves money and also improves the system. If the gentlemen do not mind, I would love to just kind of weigh in.

This is an example of a program that simply was growing at more than 10 percent to 12 percent a year, doubling every 5 to 7 years, depending on which years it was growing, and we said that we felt that we could make a savings in the program, allow it to grow at about 6.5 percent a year, save \$270 billion in the process. We were able to do it by actually improving the service.

I have had people say, "How could I vote for the Medicare plan?" I say, "Describe it to me." They describe a plan described by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, which is not our plan. Our plan has no copayment, no increase in the copayment, no increase in deduction, no new deduction. The premium stays at 31½ percent. As health care costs go up, the premium will go up at 31½ percent of additional health care costs. Who pays the other part of that Medicare Part B premium? The taxpayer. They pay 68½ percent.

We are saying that the taxpayers will continue to pay 68½ percent. Taxpayers will pay more and more of Medicare. Now, we have this plan and we basically do not change in a negative way any beneficiary except, candidly, some in my district that tend to be wealthy. Those who are the wealthiest, if you make \$100,000, you would start to pay more for Medicare part B. If you make more than \$125,000 and you are married, you start to pay more for Medicare part B. The wealthier, more affluent will pay more for a certain part of Medicare, but only the wealthiest.

Then I have people who say, "Congressman, I want the same kind of health care you have: Choice." What we have done with our Medicare plan is give them choice. We allow people to stay in the traditional fee-for-service system they have, or we say they can go and get any host of new programs.

The only way that they have to leave, they never have to leave, they can stay as long as they want in the present Medicare System, they keep their same doctors, and they would only leave if they proactively decide to leave. If they leave and get into private care plans, they can come back every month for the next 24 months, the next 2 years. We allow people to go in, and if they do not like it, they can come back and get what they always have had.

I think to myself, how can anyone oppose it? No increase in copayment, no increase in deduction, the premium stays at 31½ percent, and now they have MedicarePlus. They get to choose. Why would they leave the system they have? They can get eye care, dental care, they might get a rebate on their copayment or deduction, or they may have their Medigap paid for the new plan, or there may be no Medigap costs.

We devised a plan that gives them choice, allows them to keep what they have, allows the program to grow from \$4,800 per beneficiary to \$6,700 per beneficiary. To me this is just one of the good examples that we have found a way, nothing magical about it, just good common sense, to save money in Medicare and increase and improve the plan for everyone, and in the process save Medicare.

I would just make this final point: What happens to the \$270 billion of savings? One hundred and thirty-three billion dollars of it goes into the Medicare part A trust fund that is going bank-

rupt. One hundred and thirty-seven billion dollars of it goes into Medicare part B, so that \$270 billion is saving the program from bankruptcy. It is not going into the general fund, it is not being used for tax cuts. It is going directly into saving the Medicare plan.

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I think one of the things we forget about Medicare is that this is a program that is paid for by taxes on the wages of working people, or by seniors through their premiums.

We have an obligation, a serious fiduciary duty, to act in the best interests of the trusts and in the participants in the program. As the gentleman says, any dollars that are saved are staying in the program, but when we looked at the problems, and I want to speak to this, because I campaigned on the trustees' report, not this past year but over a year ago, in April 1994 when the trustees came out and said that all three of the major trust funds were going to run out of money, including the disability fund, the Medicare fund, and even the general trust fund.

I decried the fact that Congress and past Congresses had just blown this off, as if it was no big deal and nothing to worry about. I thought that was outrageous, and I think many of the voters that I spoke to felt exactly the same way.

When this later report came out in April 1995 and said exactly the same thing, I went back to my district and said, "This is exactly what I have been talking about for the last year." There is something else. Forget the fact that the trustees have warned us that the fund goes into deficit next year, and goes bankrupt by the year 2002. Let us forget the fact for a minute that despite all of the false accusations, we are actually going to provide a rate of increased funding that is twice the rate of inflation, maybe three times the rate of inflation, depending on the rate of inflation, but roughly, we are looking at about a 6 percent to 7-percent annual increase in spending, a per beneficiary increase from \$4,800 to \$6,700 per beneficiary per year, an astounding amount of money. Forget all of that for a minute. Let us assume none of these problems exist.

When I look at the choices that the gentleman from Connecticut and the gentleman from Michigan and others have developed, I see options that are potentially very positive, particularly for a State like mine, the State of Maine. We have a problem with rural health care.

We have a big government program in the form of Medicare that is highly consolidated, which drives participants and drives costs to the urban centers. We are going to be creating options in this plan for local physicians to establish their own provider service networks, which will give local seniors the ability to choose a health plan that is actually oriented to their own communities.

I see this as potentially helping reverse the trend toward elimination of rural health care, and consolidation in the urban areas. I think it is an exciting option, which, frankly, we ought to be considering whether or not there were problems with the Medicare System.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If the gentleman will yield, I think if we go back and say, "Why can we do this?" When we are taking a look at Medicare, we are taking a look at a program that started in the 1960's; that basically for 30 years has remained unchanged.

I entered the work force in 1977. From 1977 to 1992, before I came into Congress, in the private sector we saw an explosion of, sure, health care costs, but also an explosion of health care options.

□ 2340

Changes, innovations in terms of the choices I had to make, the services that the company that I worked for provided. The options that they provided me and my family for health care coverage, all kinds of innovations going on in the health care field, none of which made their way into Medicare.

So now, finally, in 1995, we are bringing and we are catching up to 1960's program, fee-for-service, traditional fee-for-service. The most expensive, inefficient way to provide health care to individuals. We are updating that.

For those that like that program, I had that at my own employer. I said, "If you want to keep a traditional program, you can do that, but here are some other options which may be more exciting and more advantageous to you. Take a look at them."

Mr. Speaker, and that is the same thing we are doing. If you like the traditional fee-for-service Medicare Program, can you keep it. Your premiums stay the same. Your copays do not change. It is the same program.

Mr. LONGLEY. Again, I want to re-emphasize exactly what the gentleman from Michigan is saying. What we are really saying to the seniors of this country is that we are going to guarantee them the right to keep Medicare as they know it, if that is what they want. We are also going to be providing choices in either managed care type programs, or what I also view as an exciting opportunity, the possibility that they could obtain an association-sponsored plan or a union-sponsored plan or a company-sponsored plan that could continue after they turn 65 and would normally be in the Medicare Program.

By the way, if they do not like any of those programs, we are going to guarantee them the right on a monthly basis to go back into Medicare. It is astounding to me that we would be criticized for providing this kind of choice.

Mr. SHAYS. If the gentleman would yield, I was asked by a Time magazine reporter, she wanted to follow me around because she heard that so many people did not like the Medicare plan. She came to Greenwich and I had a dialog on the radio and people seemed

comfortable with it. She was disappointed and she said "I know that people do not like it." I said, "You come to Bridgeport and we will get on Tim Quinn's program and I will let him get the troops all riled up."

We got there a half an hour after he started the program. The first call, I noticed that the Time reporter was very excited. The first call was, "Mr. SHAYS, I have a problem with my heart and I have Dr. So-and-so. I have a problem with my kidney, and I have Dr. So-and-so. My regular doctor is So-and-so." And they said, "Am I going to be denied the ability to have those doctors?" The answer was a simple, "No."

Just to reiterate the point, the calls from that point on, when people understood the plan was, "Tell me more about the plan." We can talk a long time about Medicare. The bottom line is that it is an exciting program that we are doing with MedicarePlus. Participants can keep the old system or get a new system.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. We can go back to how we started this special order. We went through a process in designing this new Medicare program of listening to seniors; listening to providers; listening to doctors; taking a look; listening; learning.

We are now in a process, we are still listening and learning as we roll out this program, but we are helping people understand what we are doing and we are leading which is our responsibility. We have gone through the steps. Listen, learn, help, lead.

Mr. LONGLEY. Something else, and this is important, we are daring to shatter the stereotypes that Washington will not respond to the problems that the average Americans are experiencing. It is demonstrating to me how entrenched many of the vested interests are in this city and how absolutely desperate they are to avoid any type of change whatsoever.

I think it is exciting that we are willing to stand up to the special interests and make the kinds of changes that we need to make; not only improve these programs to strengthen them for the future, but candidly on a positive basis to provide the kinds of choices that up to now Americans will not have ever had.

Mr. SHAYS. The concept of listening, learning, helping. We helped to make this program a better program and now we are going through the process of leading, and leading takes some heat. I am more than eager, because I believe so strongly in what we are doing, to take that heat.

Mr. Speaker, I give my colleague the minute left to close up this discussion.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I think we told the staff that has been so gracious in staying that we are going to let them out early. We will do this in the Republican way. We will not take the full hour; we will take 59½ minutes.

Mr. LONGLEY. I say to my colleagues, I appreciate the opportunity to be on the floor with you tonight.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back and I hope, Mr. Speaker, I have the opportunity to be at the dais and have you have a special order. It is a quarter of 12. You have been here a very long time and we thank you from the bottom of our heart.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for yesterday and today, November 13 and 14, on account of illness.

Mr. TUCKER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for the week of November 13, on account of official business.

Mr. VOLKMER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) after 3:30 p.m. today, on account of illness in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. THURMAN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HILLIARD, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOLEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KIM, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TIAHRT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RIGGS, for 5 minutes each day, on November 14 and 15.

Mr. LEACH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BISHOP, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

Mr. NEAL in two instances.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

Mr. STOKES.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. MILLER of California.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOLEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. OXLEY.

Mr. CALVERT.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. SMITH of Texas.

Mr. ALLARD.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. HORN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SHAYS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STARK.

Mr. PACKARD.

Mr. COSTELLO.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida.

Mr. WHITE.

Mr. OBERSTAR.

Mr. REED.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. HAYES.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. Thomas, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following title:

On November 13, 1995:

H.J. Res. 115. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 15, 1995, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1674. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving United States exports to Trinidad and Tobago, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1675. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistant Agency; transmitting notification that the Department of Defense has completed delivery of defense articles, services, and training on the attached list to Jamaica, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2318(b)(2); to the Committee on International Relations.